



## ADOT STATEWIDE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN



### KINGMAN DISTRICT AGENCY STAFF WORKSHOP

May 10, 2006 / 2:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

Powerhouse Visitor's Conference Center  
120 West Route 66, Kingman, Arizona

## ATTENDANCE

Dale Buskirk, Planning Director, ADOT

John Reid, *Kingman BLM*

Jack Kramer, *City of Kingman*

Robert DeVries, *Kingman Police*

Mike Warren, *ADOT, Kingman District*

Mike Kondelis, *ADOT, Kingman District*

Jeff Pulfer, *City of Bullhead City*

Shad Springer, *City of Bullhead City*

W. Mark Clark, *Lake Havasu City*

Roxanne Turner, *ADOT, Kingman District*

Eric Nelson, *Mohave County Public Works*

Dave Barber, *WACOG*

Ruben A. Sánchez, *BLM*

## Consultant Staff in Attendance

Rick Ensdorff, URS

Caraly Foreman, URS

Cristina Cook, URS

## HANDOUTS:

Agency Outreach Meeting – Agenda (1 page)

Conceptual Access Management Decision Flow Chart (1 page)

Arizona Statewide Access Management Program Overview (pamphlet)

Benefits Of A Statewide Access Management Program For Arizona (pamphlet)

## MEETING SUMMARY

An Agency Staff Workshop of the Statewide Access Management Program project was held on May 10, 2006 at the Powerhouse Visitor's Conference Center located at 120 West Route 66 in Kingman.



## 1. Introductions

Dale Buskirk began introductions and gave some information on what the project means, and the importance of stakeholder participation.

Mike Kondelis stated that this was the first workshop of a series that will be done statewide to help develop the Access Management Program. For those in attendance, he asked that they please spread the word to local agencies and officials and senior management about this program.

Rick Ensdorff asked the attendants to go around the room and introduce themselves. He then gave a quick background of his professional experience. He presented a brief summary of why the program is needed, and talked about the importance and benefits of Access Management Program, how we got to where we are, and provided samples of other efforts like State of Colorado and New Mexico, and the objective of access management. The process was interactive, including agenda and handouts.

## 2. PowerPoint Presentation

A PowerPoint presentation, which will also be available on the website, was presented and discussed the following:

- What is Access Management
- Access Features Typically Managed
- Benefits of Access Management
- NHCRP Report 420-Impacts of Access Management Techniques
- Crashes in Arizona, 2003, Access Related Crashes in Arizona
- Policy Initiative
- Arizona Access Management Program Work Flow Diagram and Schedule
- Access Decisions:
  - Access Permitting Process
  - Planning
  - Local Agencies
  - ADOT Construction Practices
  - Arizona Highway Projects
  - Right of Way Activities
  - Transportation Board
  - Traffic and Safety Programs
- Vision Statement
- Program Objectives
- Local Agency Perspective on Access Management
- How a Statewide Access Management Program will work.
- Conceptual Access Management Decision Flow Chart
- ADOT/Local Agency Coordination
- Classification System
- Access Classifications: The Heart of the Program



## ADOT STATEWIDE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN



### KINGMAN DISTRICT AGENCY STAFF WORKSHOP

- Hierarchy of Access Classifications
- Access Classification Considerations
- Colorado Classification System
- Key Design Elements
- Waiver/Variance Process
- Other Considerations: Access Management Plans, Interim Permit Approval
- Brief Your Local Officials
- Business and Development Community Participation
- District Agency Outreach

The project's Vision Statement was discussed. Rick Ensdruff explained that we need to have a framework but it needs flexibility and a way to deal with "gray areas". Keep the program consistent and reliable while allowing local flexibility to manage access decisions over time.

Rick Ensdruff explained that Access Management is defined as a systematic management of location, spacing and design of access roads and access points. The benefits of Access Management were further explained, including Safety, Mobility, and Economic.

Dave Barber highlighted other states' efforts such as New Mexico and Florida and their successes.

Rick Ensdruff replied that in the past, safety wasn't really tied to access roads or access points. However, the focus is now on safety in relation to Access Management. He also stated that in the past there was a lack of access management and not enough traffic signals and that the State of Arizona needs a consistent statewide policy.

Mark Clark Asked if Bullhead City/Havasupai area curb cuts had been overlooked in which Dale Buskirk responded that they have not. Mark Clark and Dale Buskirk also stated that a legislative buy-in is required and that is why this program is needed. Dave Barber asked if there is data that was tied to this information. Dale informed him that it was not part of this study program.

Rick explained TAC establishment and composition as well as the Work Flow Diagram. He mentioned that the Access Management has many benefits and ADOT and local agencies need to start a partnership that will be the key to make this program a success.

The goal in Safety would be to reduce the incident of car crashes in a 50%, increase pedestrian and cyclists safety and to increase roadway capacity 23-45%.

He also stated that legal review has been done with AG. The Current study is nearly completed, providing an overview of where we are at and now heading. He also informed that the PowerPoint and other information will be available on the website. Dave Barber asked what was going to be the method of Final Draft.



Caraly Foreman asked attendees to identify and discuss what their biggest access challenges are and what they believe is unique and different in this District.

Attendees stated and agreed that their biggest challenge is currently having “unlimited” and no controls over access.

Mark Clark provided Mohave Valley SR 95 and SR 68 as an example of where unlimited access is an issue, as well as discussed unlimited left hand turn lane challenges, as the communities in the area are landlocked. Dale Buskirk replied that bypasses are commonly asked for however they are not tangible as they are expensive and would need to be protected. Mark Clark replied that in large parts of these areas, this is the only real option versus urban renewal.

Mark Clark stated that classification for these areas needs to be identified.

The City of Bullhead City stated concerns about SR 68 becoming US 95, as unlimited access concerns need to be looked at.

Mark Clark then referred to Grand Avenue in Phoenix as an access control / interchanges example.

The Bullhead City Representative suggested that, instead of bypasses, perhaps the solution is a loop, similar to 470. Rick Ensdorff replied that is a toll facility. Rick then asked attendees, “What happens locally, when asking for a permit from ADOT?”

Mike Kondelis responded that there are two types of permits:

- A Small Business, often landlocked, wanting to buy adjacent land and improve.
- In a big development, there is not really a way of saying no, it means to deny access, in which you will want to work with locals and developers as best as possible.

Dale Buskirk asked attendees to explain how much their local Council and Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Committees take into account ADOT impacts. Dave Barber stated newer areas require traffic impact studies and older areas not as much control at the City Planning and Zoning level due to established land, adjacent state land, etc.

Mike Kondelis stated that locally, ADOT does not have a way to deny access. They cannot go in and actually buy landowners out. If a landowner is landlocked, he believes that we have to give them access. Dale Buskirk suggested that maybe access could be available on a parallel city or country street or by a private facility. Using Ft. Collins as an example, Rick Ensdorff explained that with this program, we cannot go back and fix access issues but can move forward, and over time, it ultimately works.



As locals grow larger, maybe consideration for existing road taking on a larger role (e.g.: parkway, loop, or new roadway designation). Land use decisions ultimately play the key role, especially if land use and new development affects other areas or the dynamics of an area.

Rick Ensdruff discussed the Decision Flow Chart slide. He indicated that the development of the Access Management has not been developed and that it will be by working with those in the room and additional resources.

Rick Ensdruff asked attendees if permits have ever been denied because of a traffic impact study. Discussion followed in which attendees indicated that there were many other factors that also had to be taken into account before denying a permit.

To Mike Kondelis, Rick Ensdruff then asked how often meetings are held between the ADOT Kingman District and the locals. Mike informed Rick Ensdruff that there are monthly meetings with each local jurisdiction individually.

Rick Ensdruff then returned to the "Classifications" slide in the presentations and provided background on developers' involvement in the process. He also included additional Fort Collins experience examples, such as where the developers actually did homework before applying for a permit based on the classification system, which prevented "the wheel from being reinvented each time."

During the presentation, Rick Ensdruff used SR 74 as an example.

Roxanne Turner asked if the ability to purchase right-of-way could be added as a box in the Decision Flow Chart. She added that if right-of-way cannot be purchased, it should be added or explored as another option box, as this is an important issue. Rick Ensdruff replied that we would explore that as the process moves forward with her and other attendees' help.

Rick Ensdruff went on to discuss the next steps and action items needed for the project to move forward. He indicated that we needed to leave them with important homework to go back to their organizations and to brief the local agencies and officials, especially the elected officials and senior management, about this Access Management Program. Dale Buskirk suggested having a special session for the elected officials. Dave Barber responded that this was not really an option. Mark Clark suggested that they be informed via a special letter, which was agreed upon and designated as homework for the team and those present. Rick informed the group that the officials will have additionally available to them CDs, brochures, handouts, and the website. Dave Barber requested that he be provided with 12 copies of the presentation and brochures for the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Rick Ensdruff discussed the upcoming district outreach meetings schedule for the project. He stated that the next series will be in September and October for Classification Orientation and in March and April for the Implementation Briefings.



Rick Ensdorff then asked for feedback on the value of this presentation to the attendees and asked for suggestions for the future ones.

Dale Buskirk suggested that breaks be permitted during the workshops. Suggestion was received asking that, as most of the attendees tend to be a pretty “savvy” bunch, it would be helpful to maybe hustle through the beginning of the presentation and get into the “meat and potatoes” portion, sooner. Dale Buskirk reiterated that the letter that we plan to send to elected officials needs to brief them and let them know what is happening, but it is important to also let them know in it when they need to actually get engaged.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting ended at 4:30 p.m.